



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

The Mexican War in 1846 added forty-eight millions to the small debt which had been occasioned by the financial panic of 1837. In 1860 the civil expenditure of the government was \$1.03 per capita, while that chargeable to war was 97 cents. At the close of the war, which had heaped up the vast debt so well known, the per capita charge on account of war and its burdens was, in 1870, \$6.15, while the civil expenditure was but \$1.46 per capita. During the next sixteen years the total expenditures of the government, in spite of the increase in pensions, had materially decreased, till in 1886 the per capita cost of government was only \$4.22.

Then came the period of naval expansion, etc., which has brought the per capita cost of government up to \$7.12, \$4.43 of which (sixty-two per cent.) is interest, pensions and armaments as against \$2.69 (thirty-eight per cent.) for all civil purposes. "With us, as with all other peoples," Mr. Bullock concludes, "the national government is, upon its financial side, mainly a huge machine for collecting money to meet the direct and indirect results of settling disputes by the appeal to arms." "For all the purposes of the taxgatherers, at least, we seem to have become a militant power."

Referring to the large increase of expenditures for military purposes since 1897, the average now being about two hundred millions annually, he says that "this result should surprise no one who is familiar with the history of military armaments." The deficits now occurring in the national revenues make it "clear that our existing revenue system is inadequate for the support of the national household in its present imperial state." The little economies which Congress is now, with some show of alarm, trying to practice, will be found useless. "So long as existing policies are unchanged, we shall be saving at the spigot and wasting at the bung." No imperial power can economize. Deficits must be met by more loans or new taxes. If we are going to continue "imperially minded," "we must learn to play the game of war as others play it, and not be guilty of such *gaucherie* as talking about economy." "We have changed our mode of living, and must now be ready to defray the bills as they come in. This is the one lesson taught by the history of militarism ever since the invention of gunpowder and public debts."

One cannot read the argument of Mr. Bullock's array of figures without asking himself how the people can be aroused to the perilous condition into which the nation has already fallen. The man in the street seems to know nothing, care nothing about it. To the average person of some intellectual development such an article as that of Mr. Bullock is little more than "polite literature." The big figures are a fine thing to amuse oneself with, and pride is taken by the average citizen in the fact that our country is soon to "go it one bigger" than any other

nation. The great money getters are delighted with a situation which enables them to exploit international disputes and the system of "skull-splitting," so as to amass huge fortunes and wield a power greater than that of kings and parliaments. The system of running war on borrowed money and huge debts, and allowing it to be turned by a few financiers into a colossal business enterprise, is about the greatest and most blinding evil with which civilization is now confronted. People do not even pause to think what it is going to mean to humanity when all the estates, the incomes, the wages of labor, the food, the clothing, the shelter, in fact, all the possessions and gains of all kinds, come to be loaded with imposts to meet the interest and principal of these colossal and ever-growing debts which the war system is saddling upon the world.

"Who shall deliver us from this body of death?"

### Annual Meeting of the American Peace Society.

The Seventy-seventh Annual Business Meeting of the American Peace Society will be held in the Society's room, 31 Beacon Street, Boston, on May 18, at 2 o'clock P. M., to elect officers for the coming year, to receive the Annual Reports of the Board of Directors and of the Treasurer, and to transact any other business that may properly come before the meeting.

In the evening at 6.30 o'clock, at the rooms of the Twentieth Century Club, there will be a dinner for the members and their friends. The dinner will be followed by addresses on the present condition and prospects of the international peace movement. Hon. Robert Treat Paine will preside. Good speakers are expected, whose names will be announced in due time in special notices to all the members.

Tickets to the dinner will be one dollar each, and should be applied for as early as practicable.

### Editorial Notes.

#### Efforts to End Wars.

In his address at Manchester, England, before the Peace Conference of business men held on the 28th of March, Sir Thomas Barclay referred to conversations which he had had with a Japanese statesman and a Russian gentleman, both of whom had told him that they would be glad to do all in their power to end the terrible war in the East, if he would only suggest some method of stopping it. Dr. Barclay said in reply to the question, How? "Nobody knows how to bring a war to an end when it has once begun. This is one of the worst sides of war." Nothing is truer. Looking back through recent history, it is

seen that all the efforts put forth to end wars once under way have been dead failures. This has never been more conspicuously so than in the case of the present war, for the arrest of which more efforts have been made than in the case of perhaps all the other wars of a century taken together. Richard Cobden once said, after some bitter experience, that he would never again open his mouth to try to stop hostilities after the first gun had been fired and the passions of war were aflame. He considered it an effort wasted. This is doubtless an overstatement. Efforts to end a war, though having no immediate effect, do much often to train men to more earnest peace work after the carnage has ceased. But, after all, they are very poor peace workers who wait till a war is raging and then rush in with passionate appeals expecting the belligerents who are at each other's throats, insane with madness and determination to conquer, to stop amid blows and listen to reason. When two dogs fight, you take them by the heels and pull them apart. But there is no effective way to get hold of the heels of the nations to separate them. The right time to work for peace, ardently and incessantly, is in time of peace.

**Notable Address  
by Mr. Straus.**

The department of political science of the Brooklyn Institute, Long Island, gave its meeting of the evening of April 15 to the consideration of the subject of international arbitration. Hon. Oscar S. Straus, Ex-Minister to Turkey and one of the United States representatives on the Hague tribunal, was the speaker, and gave a notable address on the Hague Conference and the Permanent International Court of Arbitration. Mr. Straus believes that "the scope and meaning of the Hague Treaty are much broader and deeper than is generally known." Though reference of disputes to the Court is only voluntary, he considers it to be for this reason the more binding, because "it rests purely and simply on international honor," "the most binding international power." He himself would leave it there, and not attempt to put any sanction of force behind it. Speaking of the failure of the arbitration treaties negotiated by Secretary Hay, Mr. Straus expressed the following opinion:

"In the last election the opponents of the President claimed that he would be a dangerous man, and that he would swing the 'big stick' and involve the nation in endless wars; yet within the very month of his inauguration these very men were the first to oppose the arbitration treaties that he had caused to be negotiated with other powers, because they were unwilling to intrust the President with too much power in maintaining peace. While from some points of view, especially from the point of view of not intrusting the President with too much power for peace, it is to be regretted that these arbitration treaties were amended to defeat, yet in a larger sense, and in the sense that these arbitration treat-

ties were too limited in their scope, I do not regret their defeat. This is my reason: These little arbitration treaties expressly exclude from arbitration the more important differences between nations, namely, those that come under the head of 'vital interests' and 'national honor.' The great Hague treaty makes no such exclusion; on the contrary, it provides that 'the signatory powers agree to use their best efforts to insure the pacific settlement of international differences.' While this treaty recognized that questions of a judicial character and of the interpretation of treaties are most suitable for arbitration, it nowhere excluded or purposed to exclude any and all other differences that might arise between nations."

In closing Mr. Straus expressed the belief that the old doctrine, "If you wish peace prepare for war," will give way to the new doctrine, "If you wish to maintain peace, prepare for peace." "The very fact that behind the world's diplomacy stand ever open the doors of the Hague Tribunal cannot fail to have an ever-increasing voice in the chancelleries of nations. Instead of the barbaric cry that has rung through history, 'To arms, to arms,' the voice from out the great Temple of Peace will appeal to the conscience of nations, and its message will ring out, 'To The Hague, to The Hague.'"

**The Queen  
for Peace.**

King Edward has an admirable helpmeet in his efforts to promote peace and goodwill among the nations. Queen Alexandra evidently looks deeper into the true nature of things than those women who are moved to uncontrollable emotion by strains of martial music, rows of brass buttons and the glitter of gold lace. A representative of the Paris *Gauleis* has reported to his paper a conversation with her, in which, among other things, she gave utterance to the following sentiments:

"Your talk, as men, is of war, but we women speak always of peace — peace in every nation, peace between all nations. I was educated in the school of a King who was before all things just, and I have tried, like him, always to preach love and charity. I have always mistrusted warlike preparations, of which nations seem never to tire. Some day this accumulated material of soldiers and guns will burst into flames in a frightful war that will throw humanity into mourning on earth and grieve our universal Father in heaven."

The last sentence shows that the Queen has the right view of the continual increase of the armies and navies of the world. It ought to be put up as an inscription over the door of the Admiralty Office in London, at the entrance of the Imperial Palace in Berlin, and on the door posts of the White House at Washington.

**Mr. d'Estournelles  
in the Senate.**

Mr. d'Estournelles de Constant, the Parliamentary leader of the arbitration forces in France, is destined, it seems, to do as valuable work in the Senate as he has already done in the Chamber of Deputies. On the eleventh of

April he made his *début* in the Senate, to which he was elected last November. The speech delivered by him dealt with the question of European disarmament and attracted notable attention. He maintained that naval expenses were ruining France. The naval program to which the government was committed contemplated the expenditure of nearly three hundred million dollars by 1917. The nation had not the resources to meet these colossal expenditures. The same was true of Great Britain and Germany. This program meant enormous burdens for posterity. He urged that the states of Europe should enter into an agreement for the proportional reduction of their forces. He cited statements made by leading statesmen of Great Britain, Germany and Russia favoring a European accord for the limitation of naval expenses. He illustrated the possibility of mutual disarmament by reference to the action of Chile and the Argentine Republic. He asked that the work begin by France negotiating an agreement with Great Britain, which the other naval powers should be asked to join. He declared that the limitation of naval expenses would benefit the whole world, particularly Russia, Japan and the United States, by leaving them free to develop their commercial resources instead of further augmenting their war fleets. Notwithstanding the unusual difficulties of the problem the question of the reduction of armaments has become the leading one in European, indeed, in world, politics, and all patriotic, progressive statesmen of both hemispheres will be compelled in a short time by the very necessities of the situation to take the same ground that Mr. d'Estournelles has taken in this notable speech.

**The World State.** The idea of a world state is making its way very rapidly. Professor Myers, the well-known historian, devotes to it the last chapter of the new edition of his *Mediaeval and Modern History*, just published by Ginn & Company of Boston. He takes the most advanced ground on the subject. He declares that "there is no tendency in universal history, broadly viewed, more manifest than the tendency toward world-unity." Union, not disunion, perpetual peace, not perpetual war, is the destiny of the race. The first group of men was the clan. Then came the city-state at the dawn of history, as in Babylonia and elsewhere. Then after two thousand years came the nation-states of modern times. During the past century the federal state appeared, as illustrated by the United States, the Swiss Confederation and the new German Empire. We are inevitably passing from a nation-epoch to a federation-epoch. National federalism must logically issue in international federalism. A United States of Europe is certain to come. The difficulties in the way of its realization are much less than those which have been over-

come in the bringing together of the discordant elements in Italy and Germany. The large success of the federal principle in fashioning the great federated nations creates a reasonable hope that the same principle will ultimately create a world-federation of all the nations. Modern achievements in many domains have prepared the way for this — the establishment of free democratic institutions with the power in the hands of the people, the annihilation of space and time by modern discoveries and inventions, the large growth of international association, the appearance of a social conscience demanding justice everywhere. These points Professor Myers develops in an interesting way, touching upon the Hague Conference and its great result, the Hague Court, the Interparliamentary Union, the call for a new conference at The Hague, etc. All these show, he believes, that the great normal tendencies of the time are all toward an international state, as conceived by Kant, "which will grow and at last embrace all the peoples of the earth," and bring perpetual peace. This manner of interpreting history, which is practically new, will soon become the habit of all historical writers. Professor Myers has done a most invaluable service in this direction, and we congratulate him upon it.

All the friends of international arbitration and peace are heartily glad that Mr. Theophile Delcassé, who has been for eight years French Minister of Foreign Affairs, is not to leave the Cabinet, as it was announced that he was about to do. Mr. Delcassé has guided the foreign affairs of his country with remarkable skill and success. He has introduced a new era of stability in French policy. He has been retained in the Department of Foreign Affairs through several changes in the Prime Ministry. His great success has come from his thorough honesty, straightforwardness and sincere devotion to a policy of peace. He was not only most influential in promoting the project for the arbitration treaty with Great Britain which was signed on the 14th of October, 1903, but also in securing, the following spring, the agreement between the two governments for the adjustment of all their outstanding differences — an agreement which has justly been styled the greatest diplomatic triumph of modern times. Mr. Delcassé's continuance in office practically insures the maintenance of a policy of peace on the part of France in dealing with the difficulties that have arisen over the Moroccan question and with the complications arising out of the Eastern war.

**Battleships in the Junk Pile.**

Great Britain has recently verified for us a statement which has often been made within the last decade, that one of the follies of the whole naval expansion business is that the

ships once built at enormous expense become useless in about a dozen years, because of constant improvement in the types and manner of construction. On April 4 at the Chatham dockyard thirty-one superannuated British war vessels were auctioned off to the highest bidder. Among them were twelve cruisers and two torpedo boats. These vessels cost originally about fifteen millions of dollars, to say nothing of their annual maintenance. Three of the largest of the cruisers were brand new only seventeen years ago. The amount realized for the entire thirty-one was only \$690,600. This was only a little more than the average cost of each of them. More than fourteen millions of dollars, therefore, has gone into the navy junk heap. Similar sales of useless war ships may be expected soon in several other countries. The folly of continuing to build these costly vessels, only to have them knocked to pieces after a dozen years, appears nearly beyond comprehension, when one remembers that the governments, if they were honestly disposed to do so, — as they ought to be, — might with the greatest ease reach an agreement in less than six months for the reduction of the navies of the world to merely nominal proportions. There are none so blind as those who will not see, and nations seem to be capable of more incurable voluntary blindness than individuals.

#### Women and War.

It has often been claimed that if women had the suffrage and the control of political affairs which this would give them, they would very speedily abolish war. There is no doubt that a larger proportion of women than of men are opposed to war, as it is naturally more offensive to them because of the place they occupy in the home where the boys are born and brought up, who afterwards are taken in time of war to furnish "food for powder." But now and then incidents occur which show how much serious work needs to be done among women before they are brought as a class to entertain sensible views on war matters. At the recent annual meeting of the National Council of Women some of the ladies were very much stirred up over some remarks made by Lucia Ames Mead on the impropriety of teaching the school children to sing "the army and navy forever" and "then conquer we must, for our cause it is just," and they proceeded to declare, somewhat nervously and indiscriminately, that the greatest parts of our country's history have been its wars, and that the patriotic songs are just what the children ought to be filled full of. These women seem not to have observed the extremely bad teaching involved in some so-called patriotic songs. They ought to remember that besides true patriotism there is a spurious, sentimental, swell-head kind, that is the worst possible stuff to put into a boy's head through the jingle of a song.

And, further, that some of our wars which these women pronounce "great and glorious" are now universally by the national conscience pronounced to have been wicked and totally unnecessary. Women, a good many of them, will have to be brought to see that brass buttons and gold lace and glittering ranks of bayonets, of which they seem naturally so fond, are not the essential elements in honor, before we can feel certain that they would, if given the chance, take war by the lapel and turn it out of doors. We do not mean by these remarks that the National Council of Women is to be judged as a whole by the demonstrations of certain of its "patriotic" members. The Council has a strong Committee on Peace and Arbitration which annually, on the 18th of May, holds a universal demonstration of women. It has taken up this subject as one of the foremost on its program, and is exerting a mighty influence throughout the nation in favor of more rational ideas of international relations. These intelligent and noble American women are helping to bring in an era when nobody will permit himself — or herself — to sing, "The army and navy forever." Nobody ought to sing it now.

#### Dinner to Mr. Bartholdt.

As a mark of appreciation of the eminent services which he is rendering to the cause of international arbitration and peace. Hon. Richard Bartholdt, member of Congress from St. Louis, founder of the arbitration group in the United States Congress, was given a dinner at the Metropolitan Club, New York, on the evening of April 29, by Mr. Clarence W. Bowen, publisher and proprietor of the *Independent*. The guests were Mr. Hart Lyman, editor of the *New York Tribune*; John Brisben Walker, editor of the *Cosmopolitan*; Judge George C. Holt, of the United States District Court; Robert Underwood Johnson, editor of the *Century Magazine*; Arthur Brisbane, of the editorial staff of the *New York Evening Journal*; W. B. Merrill, of the editorial staff of the *New York World*; Herman Ridder, editor of the *New York Staats-Zeitung*; Hayne Davis, of the New York Bar, and writer on International Law; Hon. Samuel J. Barrows, secretary of the New York Prison Association and member of the Interparliamentary Union; Ralph M. Easley, secretary of the National Civic Federation; Dr. L. T. Chamberlain, vice-chairman of the National Arbitration Committee; Daniel Smiley, of Mohonk Lake; Dr. William Hayes Ward, editor of the *Independent*; Hamilton Hart, managing editor of the *Independent*, and Benjamin F. Trueblood, secretary of the American Peace Society. Mr. Bartholdt was in New York to sail on the 2d inst. for Europe, to spend the summer abroad. He is, as is well known, president of the Interparliamentary Union this year. It was on his initiative that the Union held

its twelfth conference in St. Louis last September as the guests of our government. Mr. Bartholdt will attend the meeting of the Executive Council of the Union at Brussels on the 18th inst., at which the program for the thirteenth conference will be made up, and will also attend the conference in September. At the dinner Mr. Bartholdt made an interesting address on the pacific settlement of disputes and the work of the Interparliamentary Union, and there were brief remarks by Mr. Lyman of the *Tribune*, Mr. Johnson of the *Century*, Mr. Merrill of the *World*, Mr. Ridder of the *Staats-Zeitung*, Mr. Hayne Davis, Mr. Barrows and B. F. Trueblood. The dinner was in every way an interesting occasion, and, given by one of the greatest of our weekly journals, was a significant evidence of the remarkable progress which the international arbitration and peace movement has recently made.

**Cincinnati  
Peace Society.**

The New Cincinnati Arbitration and Peace Society, a branch of the American Peace Society, is making an active propaganda in behalf of the cause for which it was organized. At a meeting held on the eleventh of April the society decided to circulate a petition through the churches, clubs and public buildings of Cincinnati, asking for signatures to an appeal for the arrest of the war in the East, for the general suppression of international strife, and the adoption of the régime of a general judicial tribunal among the nations of the world. The signatures to this appeal will be forwarded to the International Peace Bureau at Berne, to swell the volume of those being sent in from all parts of the world. The society has decided to observe the eighteenth day of May, the anniversary of the opening of the Hague Conference, with some fitting exercises. The churches and schools of the city will be asked to take part in the celebration. The president of the society, Professor P. V. N. Myers, the historian, and Rabbi Grossman, a member of the executive committee, will attend the Peace Congress at Lucerne, Switzerland, which opens on the nineteenth of September. The friends of peace in Cincinnati will be glad to be reminded that the Queen City was represented in the first peace congress ever held, that of 1843 in London, at which Rev. Jonathan Blanchard and Arnold Buffum, Esq., both of Cincinnati, were delegates and prominent participants. Cincinnati was also represented in the second congress, that at Brussels in 1848, by Mr. Henry Clapp, who was one of the secretaries of the congress. Mr. Clapp also attended the great Paris Congress of 1849, over which Victor Hugo presided. Mr. Hamilton Hill and Rev. Asa Mahan of Ohio were likewise delegates to this Congress. Cincinnati was also represented in the great Exeter Hall Peace Congress held in London

in 1851 by Robert R. M'Ilvaine, M. D., from Cincinnati, and three other Ohio men. No Cincinnati men have attended any of the modern series of congresses.

In the annual address before the American Academy of Political and Social Science delivered in Witherspoon Hall, Philadelphia, on April 7, Seth Low, whose subject was "The Position of the United States Among the Nations," took the ground that the United States has, contrary to what is now frequently asserted, always been a world power. It has from the beginning profoundly affected the movements of thought and of action outside of itself. It has been an outlet for the overcrowded countries of Europe. He believes, as a good many of us do not, that the United States has carried out its ideals even in the Philippines as fast as practicable, and that it will do so hereafter — which will prove a true prophecy, if we make it so. Its presence in the Philippines, he says, "is almost certain to make for international peace in the Far East." It stands for the "open door" out there, and is likely to continue to do so. Mr. Low thinks that our exclusion of the Chinese is, "from the point of view of all the political theories of the United States," indefensible. On the whole he believes the policy of protection, in spite of the way in which it lends itself to corruption in public and commercial life, has justified itself through its maintenance of a high standard of living for American workingmen. He declares it to be fortunate for the world that the United States is not in essence a warlike nation. "Both its political system and its essential spirit are friendly to peace. Because its international interests are so largely commercial, its influence everywhere must be for peace; for commerce is a lover of peace and not of war." Its sense of justice "has led it to arbitrate international disputes more freely than any other nation." He has faith that the spirit of freedom and the spirit of justice, through which the nation has accomplished so much for the world, are "certain to control the United States in all its international relationships." Some of Mr. Low's statements are open to serious criticism, but his general position is excellent, and will help to keep the nation true to its mission of freedom, justice and peace.

### Brevities.

. . . The third national congress of the French Peace Societies was held at Lille from the 26th to the 30th of April. We shall hope to give account of the proceedings in our next issue.

. . . At Ancoats, England, Professor Sadler recently said: "The teaching of national bumptiousness in the guise of patriotism is bad policy and bad manners." He might have added: "and still worse morals."